

Sightseeing at Relativistic Speed: Visual Phenomenology of a Near- c Spacecraft Crossing the Earth–Moon System

Douglas C. Youvan

doug@youvan.com

www.youvan.ai

November 11, 2025

What would we actually see if a spacecraft crossed the Earth–Moon system at a significant fraction of the speed of light? Special relativity gives clear answers about time dilation, length contraction, and aberration, but these are usually presented as algebraic curiosities, not as a concrete “out the window” experience. In this paper, we construct a worked thought experiment: a near-light-speed spacecraft enters the solar system, threads the gap between Earth and Moon, and exits again. We analyse the event from two complementary perspectives: (1) the spacecraft’s rest frame, in which the Earth–Moon separation is Lorentz-contracted and the sky is squeezed into a narrow forward cone, and (2) the Earth–Sun rest frame, in which the spacecraft appears as a rapidly moving, Doppler-shifted point of light crossing the sky in seconds. We distinguish carefully between *coordinate* effects (time dilation, length contraction) and *optical* effects (relativistic aberration, Doppler and beaming, Terrell rotation). We also examine how the Earth’s and Moon’s orbital periods are reinterpreted in the spacecraft frame, and ask a practical question: is $0.9999\,c$ actually the most visually interesting speed, or do slightly lower velocities produce richer, more observable phenomena? The result is a pedagogical but technically grounded case study in “relativistic astronomy” as it would be experienced by real observers.

Keywords: special relativity, relativistic aberration, Doppler shift, Terrell rotation, near-light-speed spacecraft, Earth–Moon system, visual appearance, time dilation, relativistic flyby, astronomical observation.

A collaboration with GPT-5. 43 pages. CC4.0.

Outline

1. Introduction: From Equations to Eyeballs
 - 1.1 Motivation: turning special relativity into a concrete sky event
 - 1.2 Frames, observers, and what “seeing” means in relativistic contexts
 - 1.3 Overview of the Earth–Moon flyby scenario
2. Kinematic Setup of the Thought Experiment
 - 2.1 Choice of frames: Earth–Sun rest frame vs spacecraft rest frame
 - 2.2 Baseline parameters: Earth–Moon separation, orbital periods, and speeds
 - 2.3 Defining “entering” and “exiting” the solar system (e.g., ± 100 AU)
 - 2.4 Timescales: solar-system crossing vs Earth–Moon threading vs onboard proper time
3. What the Spacecraft Sees: The Earth–Moon System at $0.9999\ c$
 - 3.1 Lorentz contraction of the Earth–Moon separation
 - 3.2 Relativistic aberration and the squeezing of the celestial sphere
 - 3.3 Terrell rotation: why Earth and Moon still look spherical, not “pancaked”
 - 3.4 Color and brightness: Doppler shift and relativistic beaming on approach and recession
 - 3.5 Apparent orbital periods: Earth around Sun, Moon around Earth, as seen in the spacecraft frame
4. What Earth Sees: The Relativistic Probe Crossing the Sky
 - 4.1 Inbound approach: faint blue point, accelerated variability via Doppler
 - 4.2 The one–second highlight: threading the Earth–Moon gap in the Earth frame
 - 4.3 Outbound recession: reddening, time-stretched signals, and fading into the noise
 - 4.4 Length contraction vs optical appearance: why we do not simply “see” a shorter ship
5. Coordinate vs Optical Relativity: Untangling the Effects
 - 5.1 Time dilation and length contraction as invariant relations between frames
 - 5.2 Light-cone structure, signal delay, and apparent motion
 - 5.3 Transverse Doppler vs longitudinal Doppler in the flyby
 - 5.4 The distinction between “how fast their clock runs” and “how frequently pulses arrive”
6. Is $0.9999\ c$ Really the Most Interesting Speed?
 - 6.1 Parameter sweep: γ and Doppler factor as functions of β
 - 6.2 Too fast to see? Trade-offs between extremal effects and human-scale observability
 - 6.3 A proposed “sweet spot” near 0.98 – $0.99\ c$ for visible-band drama
 - 6.4 Designing observational campaigns for hypothetical relativistic probes

7. Pedagogical and Experimental Implications
 - 7.1 Using the Earth–Moon flyby as a teaching example of relativistic optics
 - 7.2 Possible numerical simulations and ray-tracing visualizations of the scenario
 - 7.3 Connections to interstellar probe concepts and SETI-style detection strategies
8. Conclusion: Relativistic Astronomy as Lived Experience
 - 8.1 Summary of key visual and temporal features in both frames
 - 8.2 Lessons about the difference between invariant physics and appearance
 - 8.3 Future directions: from thought experiments to full relativistic sky simulators

References

1. Introduction: From Equations to Eyeballs

Special relativity is usually taught as a set of algebraic curiosities: time dilation, length contraction, and Lorentz transformations written on the board and then left there. Students learn that fast-moving clocks “run slow” and rulers “shrink,” but it is much less common to ask the more visceral question: *what would I actually see if something really did move past me at $0.99c$?* This paper takes that question literally.

Instead of abstract rockets and anonymous inertial frames, we anchor the discussion in a specific astronomical setting: a relativistic spacecraft that cuts straight through the Earth–Moon system and then disappears back into interstellar space. The physics involved is standard, but the way we package it is not. We want to go from equations to eyeballs—building a concrete, observer-centric narrative that ties the formalism of special relativity to what telescopes, cameras, and even unaided human vision would register in such an encounter.

By placing a near–light-speed craft in a familiar celestial context, we turn the Earth–Moon system into a laboratory for relativistic optics. The central aim is pedagogical but non-trivial: to show how Lorentz kinematics, aberration, Doppler effects, and Terrell rotation combine into a coherent “sky event” that could, in principle, be simulated or even one day observed.

1.1 Motivation: turning special relativity into a concrete sky event

The standard thought experiments of special relativity are often spatially and temporally sterile. Two clocks pass each other; a train enters a tunnel; a muon traverses the atmosphere. These scenarios are ideal for deriving Lorentz transformations but give little sense of what a fast-moving world actually *looks* like. As a result, many misconceptions persist: that length contraction is directly visible as a squashed object, or that time dilation simply means we see everything play out in slow motion.

Our motivation is to replace these stripped-down cartoons with a richer, astronomically grounded event. A spacecraft moving at a substantial fraction of the speed of light through the inner solar system forces us to confront both coordinate and optical aspects of relativity. What do invariant relations between frames tell us about orbital periods and distances? And separately, what does an observer on Earth or on the spacecraft *visually* perceive, once light travel time, aberration, and Doppler shifts are included?

This shift in emphasis—from algebra to appearance—serves two purposes. First, it offers a more intuitive handle on relativistic phenomena by tying them to concrete observational questions. Second, it highlights the gap between naive interpretations (“we see things contracted”) and the more subtle reality (“we see rotated, aberrated, Doppler-shifted worlds”). The Earth–Moon

flyby scenario is chosen precisely because it sits at the intersection of everyday astronomical intuition and genuinely extreme kinematics.

1.2 Frames, observers, and what “seeing” means in relativistic contexts

Any relativistic analysis begins with a choice of reference frames. In this paper we work primarily with two:

- The Earth–Sun frame, in which the Sun, Earth, and Moon are approximately at rest and follow their familiar orbits.
- The spacecraft frame, in which the ship is at rest and the entire solar system rushes past at high speed.

In each frame we can define coordinate quantities—distances, times, and velocities obtained by assigning spacetime coordinates to events and using the Lorentz transformations. These are the quantities that enter the canonical statements of time dilation and length contraction. For example, in the spacecraft frame the Earth–Moon separation along the direction of motion is reduced by the usual Lorentz factor.

However, coordinate relations are not the same as visual appearance. What an observer actually sees at a given moment depends on which photons arrive at their eyes or detectors along their past light cone. This introduces additional structure:

- Light-travel-time effects: we see each object as it was when the emitted light left it, not as it “is now” in our coordinates.
- Relativistic aberration: directions on the sky are warped; light from wide angles is compressed into a forward cone at high speeds.
- Relativistic Doppler shift and beaming: frequencies and intensities are altered depending on the relative motion along the line of sight.
- Terrell rotation: extended objects in motion can appear rotated and distorted rather than simply contracted.

Throughout the paper, we distinguish carefully between these levels of description. When we say “the spacecraft sees the Moon’s orbital period as extended,” we mean in the coordinate sense of the spacecraft’s inertial frame. When we say “from Earth the spacecraft’s beacon appears sped up on approach,” we are referring to Doppler-distorted arrival times of photons. This separation between frame relations and optical appearance is essential to prevent conceptual confusion.

1.3 Overview of the Earth–Moon flyby scenario

The specific scenario we analyze is as follows. A spacecraft travels on an almost straight trajectory through the solar system at a speed close to the speed of light. For definiteness, we consider speeds in the range $0.95\text{--}0.9999\text{ c}$ and define “entering” and “exiting” the solar system as crossing a spherical boundary at roughly 100 astronomical units from the Sun. In the Earth–Sun frame, this corresponds to a total transit time of order a day.

The trajectory is chosen so that the spacecraft passes through the approximate line joining Earth and Moon, threading the gap between them with a closest approach distance comparable to the Earth–Moon separation. In the Earth–Sun frame, the crossing of the Earth–Moon neighborhood lasts on the order of one to a few seconds, depending on the exact speed. In the spacecraft frame, the same passage is compressed to tens of milliseconds because of time dilation.

This setup allows us to ask several concrete questions:

- From the spacecraft’s frame:
 - How does the Earth–Moon distance appear after Lorentz contraction?
 - How are Earth and Moon positioned on the sky once aberration squeezes the celestial sphere?
 - What happens to the apparent orbital periods of Earth around the Sun and Moon around the Earth?
- From the Earth–Sun frame:
 - How does the spacecraft’s brightness, color, and apparent motion across the sky evolve as it approaches, threads the gap, and recedes?
 - How do time dilation and Doppler effects interplay in the observed timing of any onboard signals?
 - Over what range of speeds is the event both strongly relativistic and visually rich in the human-visible band?

The rest of the paper builds up the necessary kinematic and optical tools, applies them to this specific geometry, and then uses the results to reflect on the broader pedagogical value of treating special relativity as something that can unfold *in the sky* rather than only on the blackboard.

2. Kinematic Setup of the Thought Experiment

To make the flyby precise, we need to specify which reference frames we are using, what we mean by basic quantities like "Earth–Moon distance" and "orbital period," and how we define the spacecraft's journey through the solar system. This section lays out the minimal kinematic data: frames, parameters, and timescales. The dynamical details of how the spacecraft accelerates to its near–light-speed cruise are deliberately ignored; we treat it as already moving inertially at constant speed when it encounters the inner system.

The key simplifications are:

- (1) we ignore gravitational deflection of the trajectory,
 - (2) we treat the Earth–Moon system as rigidly following its standard orbits during the brief encounter, and
 - (3) we model the spacecraft as a point particle for kinematic purposes, adding shape and optical structure later.
-

2.1 Choice of frames: Earth–Sun rest frame vs spacecraft rest frame

We work primarily with two inertial frames:

1. The Earth–Sun rest frame (call it S)
 - The Sun is at rest at the origin to a good approximation.
 - Earth moves on a nearly circular orbit of radius 1 astronomical unit (1 AU).
 - The Moon orbits Earth at its usual distance.
 - Over the roughly one day during which the spacecraft crosses the inner solar system, all orbital motions are slow enough that we can treat them as quasi-static for local questions and periodic for questions about orbital periods.
2. The spacecraft rest frame (call it S')
 - The spacecraft is at rest at the origin, moving at constant speed v relative to S.
 - The entire solar system moves past S' with speed v , in the opposite direction.
 - The relative speed is characterized by
$$\beta = v / c,$$
$$\gamma = 1 / \sqrt{1 - \beta^2}.$$

The standard Lorentz transformation connects S and S' , with the x -axis chosen along the spacecraft's direction of motion. We assume that, in S , the spacecraft trajectory passes approximately along the Earth–Moon line when it threads the gap between them.

From the standpoint of kinematics, both frames are equally valid. S is convenient for describing what astronomers on Earth measure: sky position versus time, apparent magnitude, and spectrum of the spacecraft. S' is convenient for describing how the Earth–Moon system looks from the spacecraft: Lorentz-contracted distances, modified orbital periods, and aberrated sky. The essence of the thought experiment is to keep both descriptions in view and move between them without conflating coordinate quantities with visual appearance.

2.2 Baseline parameters: Earth–Moon separation, orbital periods, and speeds

We adopt standard values in the S frame:

- Earth–Moon separation:
 $D_{EM} \approx 3.84 \times 10^5 \text{ km}$ (mean center-to-center distance).
- Earth radius:
 $R_E \approx 6.37 \times 10^3 \text{ km}$.
- Moon radius:
 $R_M \approx 1.74 \times 10^3 \text{ km}$.
- Earth orbital period around the Sun:
 $T_E \approx 1 \text{ year} \approx 3.16 \times 10^7 \text{ s}$.
- Moon orbital period around Earth (sidereal month):
 $T_M \approx 27.3 \text{ days} \approx 2.36 \times 10^6 \text{ s}$.

For the spacecraft, we consider speeds in the near–light-speed regime, with emphasis on:

- Case A: $v = 0.95 c$
 $\beta \approx 0.95$, $\gamma \approx 3.2$.
- Case B: $v = 0.99 c$
 $\beta \approx 0.99$, $\gamma \approx 7.1$.
- Case C: $v = 0.9999 c$
 $\beta \approx 0.9999$, $\gamma \approx 70.7$.

These cases allow us to compare a moderately relativistic flyby (0.95 c) with a strongly relativistic one (0.99 c) and an extreme, almost lightlike case (0.9999 c). In S' , the Earth–Moon separation projected along the direction of motion is Lorentz-contracted to

$$D_{EM}' = D_{EM} / \gamma,$$

so for the extreme case C, D_{EM}' is only of order 5×10^3 km, less than the diameter of Earth itself.

Similarly, in S' , all periodic processes tied to Earth or the Moon appear time-dilated. The orbital periods become

$$T_E' = \gamma T_E,$$

$$T_M' = \gamma T_M,$$

so that, for $\gamma \approx 70.7$, Earth's one-year orbit expands to roughly 71 years and the Moon's 27-day orbit expands to more than 5 years in the spacecraft frame. These are coordinate statements in S' , and later we will distinguish them from what the spacecraft can actually see during its brief passage.

2.3 Defining “entering” and “exiting” the solar system (e.g., ± 100 AU)

To speak meaningfully about “entering” and “exiting” the solar system, we must choose a spatial scale beyond which the Sun's influence, for our purposes, can be ignored. A natural convention is to define a sphere of radius R_{sys} centered on the Sun and to say that the spacecraft enters the solar system when it crosses the inbound side of this sphere and exits when it crosses the outbound side.

For concreteness, we take

$$R_{\text{sys}} \approx 100 \text{ AU},$$

where $1 \text{ AU} \approx 1.5 \times 10^8 \text{ km}$ is the mean Earth–Sun distance. The diameter of this sphere is then

$$L_{\text{sys}} = 2 R_{\text{sys}} \approx 200 \text{ AU} \approx 3.0 \times 10^{10} \text{ km}.$$

In the S frame, where the spacecraft moves at speed v , the total transit time across this 200 AU span is

$$t_{\text{sys}} = L_{\text{sys}} / v.$$

For v very close to c , we can approximate $v \approx c \approx 3.0 \times 10^5 \text{ km/s}$, giving

$$t_{\text{sys}} \approx (3.0 \times 10^{10} \text{ km}) / (3.0 \times 10^5 \text{ km/s}) \approx 1.0 \times 10^5 \text{ s} \approx 28 \text{ hours}.$$

For slower near-relativistic speeds, t_{sys} increases modestly, but it remains of order one day for the speeds we consider. The exact choice of 100 AU is not crucial; any large radius beyond the major planetary orbits would serve. What matters is that the Earth–Moon encounter is a tiny fraction of the total transit.

In S' , the same crossing is stretched by the time dilation factor γ :

$$t_{\text{sys}}' = \gamma t_{\text{sys}},$$

so that, for $\gamma \approx 7$, the solar-system crossing lasts several days on the spacecraft clock, and for $\gamma \approx 70$, it extends to many weeks. Relative to this long cruise, the Earth–Moon threading is an extremely brief local event.

2.4 Timescales: solar-system crossing vs Earth–Moon threading vs onboard proper time

The thought experiment has three relevant timescales, all most naturally defined in S and then compared to S' .

1. Solar-system crossing time (already obtained):

$$t_{\text{sys}} \approx 1 \text{ day in } S,$$

$$t_{\text{sys}}' = \gamma t_{\text{sys}} \text{ in } S'.$$

2. Earth–Moon threading time

We define a local “encounter region” of characteristic length L_{EM} , of order the Earth–Moon distance:

$$L_{\text{EM}} \approx D_{\text{EM}} \approx 3.84 \times 10^5 \text{ km}.$$

The time for the spacecraft to traverse this region in S is

$$t_{\text{EM}} = L_{\text{EM}} / v.$$

For $v \approx c$, this is

$$t_{\text{EM}} \approx (3.84 \times 10^5 \text{ km}) / (3.0 \times 10^5 \text{ km/s}) \approx 1.3 \text{ s}.$$

For $0.95 c$ or $0.99 c$, the value is within a factor of order unity of this number. Thus, as seen from Earth, the spacecraft spends only about one to a few seconds in the immediate Earth–Moon neighborhood.

In S' , the same passage is time-dilated:

$$t_{\text{EM}}' = \gamma t_{\text{EM}}.$$

For $\gamma \approx 3, 7, 70$ this gives:

- $v = 0.95 c$: $t_{EM}' \approx 4 s$,
- $v = 0.99 c$: $t_{EM}' \approx 9 s$,
- $v = 0.9999 c$: $t_{EM}' \approx 90 s$.

So while terrestrial observers experience the flyby as an event lasting roughly one second, the spacecraft crew experiences the Earth–Moon encounter as being stretched to several seconds or even a minute, depending on β .

3. Onboard proper time versus observed time from Earth

The spacecraft's proper time τ along its worldline is, by construction, the time measured in S' . For any segment of the trajectory, the relation between S and S' is

$$\Delta \tau = \Delta t / \gamma,$$

when Δt is the coordinate time in S . The Earth–Moon threading, as above, has

$$\Delta t = t_{EM} \approx 1.3 s,$$

$$\Delta \tau = t_{EM}' \approx \gamma t_{EM}.$$

From the Earth's perspective, then, the ship's internal processes (clocks, computers, beacons) are slowed by γ . From the spacecraft's perspective, it is the Earth–Moon system whose clocks and orbital motions are slow.

The separation between these timescales is central to the later analysis. For observers on Earth, the event is a one-second highlight embedded in a roughly one-day transit, and any dramatic visual changes happen on human reaction timescales. For observers on the spacecraft, the same physical transit through the Earth–Moon region unfolds over several to tens of seconds, but their view of the broader solar-system crossing stretches to days or weeks. In both frames, the orbital periods of Earth and Moon are effectively frozen during the local encounter; they become relevant only in the coordinate sense, not as something visibly evolving during the flyby itself.

3. What the Spacecraft Sees: The Earth–Moon System at 0.9999 c

In the spacecraft frame S' , the vehicle is at rest while the entire solar system sweeps past at speed $v = 0.9999 c$. The key dimensionless parameters are

- $\beta = v / c \approx 0.9999$

- $\gamma = 1 / \sqrt{1 - \beta^2} \approx 70.7$

In this frame, the Earth–Moon distance along the direction of motion is Lorentz–contracted, the entire sky is dragged into a narrow forward cone by relativistic aberration, and reflected sunlight from Earth and Moon is dramatically Doppler–shifted and beamed. At the same time, Terrell rotation ensures that Earth and Moon retain a roughly spherical appearance despite large contraction factors, and the familiar orbital periods are rescaled by γ when re–expressed in S' coordinates.

3.1 Lorentz contraction of the Earth–Moon separation

Let D_{EM} be the Earth–Moon center–to–center separation measured in the Earth–Sun frame S ,

- $D_{EM} \approx 3.84 \times 10^5 \text{ km}$.

Assume, for definiteness, that the spacecraft’s trajectory is approximately collinear with the instantaneous Earth–Moon line at closest approach. In S' , the spatial separation of Earth and Moon *along the direction of motion* at a given instant of S' time is reduced by the Lorentz factor:

- $D_{EM}' = D_{EM} / \gamma$.

For $\gamma \approx 70.7$, this gives

- $D_{EM}' \approx (3.84 \times 10^5 \text{ km}) / 70.7 \approx 5.4 \times 10^3 \text{ km}$.

This contracted separation is smaller than the diameter of Earth (about $1.27 \times 10^4 \text{ km}$). In the spacecraft’s coordinate picture, Earth and Moon pass by as two bodies whose centers are separated by only a few thousand kilometers along the axis of motion, rather than almost four hundred thousand kilometers as in S .

Two consequences follow:

1. Depth compression: Earth and Moon occupy nearly the same range of distances from the spacecraft in S' . The difference in their radial distances is small compared to their overall distance, especially during the brief interval when the craft is between them.
2. Coordinate closeness vs visual overlap: This does not mean the two bodies visually overlap as disks on the sky. Visual appearance is determined by light arrival directions and times, not simply by simultaneous coordinates. Lorentz contraction tells us that, in the spacecraft’s coordinate system, the Earth–Moon line is short; aberration and Terrell rotation will determine how this compressed geometry is actually seen.

3.2 Relativistic aberration and the squeezing of the celestial sphere

Relativistic aberration describes how directions of incoming light transform between frames. If in S a photon arrives from polar angle θ relative to the spacecraft's velocity vector, then in S' its angle θ' satisfies

- $$\cos(\theta') = (\cos(\theta) - \beta) / (1 - \beta \cos(\theta)).$$

For β very close to 1, this mapping strongly compresses a wide range of angles in S into a narrow forward cone in S' . To leading order, the characteristic half-angle of this cone is about $1/\gamma$:

- $$\theta_{\text{cone}} \approx 1/\gamma \approx 1/70.7 \approx 0.8 \text{ degrees.}$$

Thus, in S' , almost all of the external universe, including the Sun, Earth, Moon, and background stars, is seen within a tiny region around the *forward* direction of motion. Light that, in S , would come from the side or even somewhat behind the spacecraft is aberrated into this forward cone.

For the Earth–Moon system this implies:

- Even if, in S , the craft passes between Earth and Moon in such a way that Earth and Moon lie roughly to opposite sides of the trajectory, in S' the directions of incoming photons from both bodies are dragged forward. Rather than appearing 180 degrees apart in the sky, Earth and Moon appear as two bright spheres separated by only a small angle, both near the forward direction.
- As the spacecraft approaches the Earth–Moon line, the apparent angular separation between Earth and Moon in S' is set more by aberration geometry and the contracted separation D_{EM}' than by their large S –frame separation. To an observer on board, the pair looks like a tight double system almost directly ahead, not like two widely separated bodies flanking the ship.

In combination with length contraction, aberration therefore yields a highly compressed, forward-focused view: the entire Earth–Moon pair is effectively a compact, bright, nearly co-located target in front of the spacecraft.

3.3 Terrell rotation: why Earth and Moon still look spherical, not “pancaked”

A naive reading of Lorentz contraction suggests that, since distances along the direction of motion shrink by $1/\gamma$, a moving sphere should look like a flattened “pancake.” Terrell and Penrose showed that this is not what an observer actually sees.

The reason is that visual appearance is determined by the set of points on the object whose emitted light reaches the observer simultaneously. For a moving sphere, this is not simply the set of points at equal coordinate time in S' , but rather a tilted slice through the object's worldtube. When this is taken into account, the image of a uniformly moving sphere on a photographic plate is indistinguishable from that of a *rotated* sphere, not a contracted one.

For the spacecraft:

- Earth and Moon are moving at speed $v = 0.9999 c$ in S' , but each remains visually close to spherical. There is no obvious squashing into a Lorentz-contracted ellipsoid in the image plane.
- The primary Terrell effect is that the visible hemisphere is skewed. For example, the observer might see features from slightly “around the edge” of the planet that would normally be hidden, as if the planet had been rotated in space. In practice, Earth's cloud patterns and surface features would be shifted in a way that encodes the motion, but the limb remains circular.

Thus, the spacecraft observer sees:

- Two nearly spherical bodies (Earth and Moon),
- At nearly the same distance,
- Subtending large angular diameters near closest approach,
- With surface detail subtly rotated and distorted,
- Rather than obviously flattened into disks that directly manifest a factor-70 contraction.

This distinction is pedagogically important: Lorentz contraction is a statement about the relation between coordinates, not about naive visual squashing.

3.4 Color and brightness: Doppler shift and relativistic beaming on approach and recession

In S' , light from Earth and Moon is Doppler-shifted and beamed due to their high speed relative to the spacecraft. For nearly head-on approach, the relativistic Doppler factor D governing frequency transformation is

- $D = \sqrt{(1 + \beta) / (1 - \beta)}$.

For $\beta = 0.9999$, one finds

- $D \approx 141$.

A photon of frequency ν in S is received with frequency $\nu' = D \nu$ in S' for purely head-on motion. Conversely, on purely receding lines of sight, the frequency is divided by approximately the same factor.

Several qualitative consequences follow:

1. Blueshift on approach

When the Earth–Moon pair is ahead of the spacecraft and still relatively distant, the dominant effect for photons arriving from near the forward direction is strong blueshift. Visible light reflected from Earth's day side is shifted toward the ultraviolet; thermal infrared emission is pushed toward the visible, and some reflected solar UV moves into the soft X-ray band in S' . To a hypothetical visual system with extended sensitivity, the Earth and Moon would appear extremely bright, with their spectra skewed to shorter wavelengths.

2. Relativistic beaming

The intensity is not only shifted in frequency but also *concentrated in angle*. If the bodies emit roughly isotropically in their local rest frames, the received specific intensity in S' along the forward direction scales as approximately D^3 relative to what a non-relativistic transformation would suggest. For $D \approx 141$, this gives an enormous brightness enhancement. Near closest approach, the Earth–Moon pair can dominate the forward sky as a brilliant double source.

3. Transition through transverse view

As the spacecraft sweeps past the Earth–Moon line, there is a brief interval during which the relative velocity is nearly transverse to the line of sight in S' . In this phase, the longitudinal Doppler contribution vanishes, and only the transverse Doppler effect (pure time dilation) remains: all processes tied to Earth and Moon appear slowed by roughly γ , and their spectra are modestly redshifted by the same time dilation factor. The visual impression momentarily changes from extreme blue–white intensity to something closer to the familiar color balance, albeit still highly distorted in direction and brightness.

4. Redsift and fading on recession

After the spacecraft has passed the Earth–Moon system, the line of sight to Earth and Moon becomes increasingly backward. Photons from them are then strongly redshifted: the Doppler factor effectively inverts, and frequencies are divided by D . Visible light can be shifted into the infrared; ultraviolet into the visible. At the same time, beaming now works against visibility: the objects are beamed away from the forward direction, and the received intensity falls rapidly.

To the spacecraft observer, then, the Earth–Moon encounter is a fast, highly asymmetric light show: initially a forward–focused, intensely blue–shifted and bright double source, briefly more neutral in color near closest lateral view, then quickly fading and reddening into the rearward sky.

3.5 Apparent orbital periods: Earth around Sun, Moon around Earth, as seen in the spacecraft frame

In the Earth–Sun frame S , the Earth and Moon follow their usual orbits with periods

- $T_E \approx 1$ year for Earth around the Sun,
- $T_M \approx 27.3$ days for the Moon around Earth (sidereal month).

In the spacecraft frame S' , all processes tied to the Earth–Moon–Sun system are time–dilated by γ . If one defines orbital periods in S' as the intervals between successive passes of Earth or Moon through a given angular position in S' , the coordinate periods satisfy

- $T_{E'} = \gamma T_E$,
- $T_{M'} = \gamma T_M$.

For $\gamma \approx 70.7$, this yields approximately

- $T_{E'} \approx 70.7$ years,
- $T_{M'} \approx 5.3$ years.

Thus, in the spacecraft’s inertial coordinate system, the Earth’s orbital motion around the Sun is slowed so that a full revolution takes on the order of seven decades, and the Moon’s orbit around Earth takes several years.

However, two important caveats apply:

1. The spacecraft’s local encounter is very brief
The proper time the spacecraft experiences while traversing the Earth–Moon neighborhood is of order

- $\tau_{EM} \approx t_{EM} / \gamma$,

where $t_{EM} \approx 1.3$ s is the Earth–frame crossing time for the Earth–Moon separation. For $\gamma \approx 70.7$, this gives

- $\tau_{EM} \approx 0.02$ s.

In the spacecraft's own clock, the Earth–Moon passage is over in a few hundredths of a second. Over such a short interval, neither the Earth's nor the Moon's orbital phase changes appreciably, even in S' . The enlarged coordinate periods are therefore not manifested as any visible orbital motion during the flyby.

2. What can be inferred vs what can be seen

If the spacecraft could track the Earth–Moon system over much longer intervals in S' —for example by continuing to observe with instruments over years of its proper time—then, by logging the apparent angular position of Earth and Moon in S' and fitting an orbital model, it could deduce that the orbital periods are larger by a factor γ than those quoted in the standard ephemerides of S . This would be a coordinate inference, not something revealed by the few milliseconds associated with the near encounter.

In practice, therefore, the spacecraft's view of Earth and Moon during the transit is quasi-static in terms of their orbits. What dominates is not the slow orbital drift but the violent changes in angle, brightness, and color produced by the spacecraft's own near-light-speed trajectory through the compressed, aberrated, and Doppler-distorted Earth–Moon geometry.

4. What Earth Sees: The Relativistic Probe Crossing the Sky

From the Earth–Sun frame, the spacecraft is just another moving object in the sky, obeying ordinary special relativity. What makes it exotic is the combination of (1) its enormous speed, (2) the very short time it spends near Earth, and (3) the extreme Doppler and beaming of any light it emits.

To ground things, keep one number in mind:

- Earth–Moon scale crossing time in the Earth frame is $t_{EM} \sim 1\text{--}2$ s for v very close to c .

So the “main event” over Earth is on the order of a second. Everything else (approach and recession across the larger solar system) plays out over ~ 1 day, and is mostly of interest to telescopes rather than naked eyes.

4.1 Inbound approach: faint blue point, accelerated variability via Doppler

Long before the spacecraft reaches the Earth–Moon system, it will have crossed the arbitrary “outer boundary” of the solar system (say at ~ 100 AU) and begun moving inward. From Earth's point of view, for most of that inbound leg it appears as:

- A star-like point source at large heliocentric distance.

- Moving slowly against the background stars at first, then more rapidly as it nears the inner system.
- Emitting whatever spectrum its engines, hull, and beacon produce, but strongly modified by relativistic Doppler and beaming.

Let its rest-frame emission be characterized by a spectrum $F_0(\nu)$ and some intrinsic time dependence: pulses, modulation, or flicker with timescale T_0 . If the craft is approaching nearly along our line of sight, the relativistic Doppler factor is

- $D = \sqrt{(1 + \beta) / (1 - \beta)}$,

so that:

- Frequencies are shifted as $\nu_{\text{obs}} = D \nu_0$.
- Time intervals between pulses are compressed as $T_{\text{obs}} = T_0 / D$.

For $v = 0.9999 c$, $\beta \sim 0.9999$, $\gamma \sim 70.7$, and D is of order 10^2 . In this regime:

- Any intrinsic variability appears sped up by a factor $\sim 10^2$ while the craft is still significantly approaching us.
- Emission that is thermal or roughly broadband in its rest frame is shifted to shorter wavelengths; if the craft radiates mostly in visible/near-IR, that gets pushed toward blue/UV in our frame.
- Relativistic beaming concentrates the light into a narrow cone along the direction of motion, making the craft appear brighter than a simple $1/r^2$ estimate would suggest once it is reasonably well aligned with our line of sight.

Seen with a good telescope well before closest approach, we would notice:

- A point source whose color gradually drifts to the blue.
- Flicker or modulated signals that speed up as the line-of-sight component of its velocity toward us grows.
- An apparent brightening that is a combination of decreasing distance and increasing beaming/Doppler boosting.

To a naked-eye observer at this stage, if it is bright enough at all, it would simply be a faint bluish “new star” creeping across the sky.

4.2 The one-second highlight: threading the Earth–Moon gap in the Earth frame

The most dramatic part of the event is when the craft passes through the inner Earth–Moon region. In the Earth–Sun frame, the distance characteristic of that region is of order $D_{EM} \sim 4 \times 10^5$ km, so the crossing time is

- $t_{EM} \sim D_{EM} / v \sim 1\text{--}2$ s for v very close to c .

As seen from Earth, a few things happen essentially at once:

1. Angular speed explodes near closest approach
 - When the craft is only a few Earth radii away, its angular speed on our sky is enormous: tens of degrees per second are entirely plausible for near-miss geometries.
 - To a ground observer under the track, the craft would cross a large fraction of the visible sky in roughly a second.

Visually, this is much more like an ultra-fast meteor than a slow-moving satellite.

2. Color and brightness peak
 - Just before closest approach, the craft is still moving with a substantial component toward us, so its emission is both blue-shifted and beamed.
 - At closest approach, the line-of-sight velocity briefly becomes more transverse, so the observed Doppler shift softens toward the transverse Doppler regime: the spectrum is modestly redshifted relative to the approach phase, reflecting pure time dilation rather than strong line-of-sight motion.
 - The combination of decreasing distance and evolving Doppler factor can produce a rapid swing in apparent color: very blue–white on approach, possibly closer to neutral or even slightly reddened near exact closest approach.

In realistic terms, without instruments you would mostly see a brief, very bright, fast-moving point, with perhaps a noticeable bluish cast if bright enough to stimulate color perception at all.

3. Geometric relation to the Moon

Because we have chosen the trajectory to thread between Earth and Moon, there are configurations where, for some observers and times, the craft passes extremely close to the Moon's apparent position:

- There could be a momentary near-occultation of the spacecraft by the Moon or vice versa, depending on the precise geometry.

- High-speed cameras or telescopes might record the craft skimming the lunar limb at relativistic speed, an event lasting only fractions of a second.

However, the Earth's rotation and the finite size of the Earth mean that only a narrow swath of the planet would see such a "perfectly aligned" event. For most observers, the Moon would simply be nearby in the sky when the streak passes.

4. Human perception vs instrumentation

For an unaided human observer:

- The event would register as a single, startling streak across the sky, perhaps bright enough to rival Venus or a bright meteor, lasting about one second.
- Any subtle color change during the pass would likely be lost unless the object is extremely bright.

For instruments:

- Millisecond-scale photometry could track the evolving spectrum throughout approach, closest passage, and recession.
- Radio receivers could record time-varying modulation of any beacon signal, showing the predicted compression (on approach), neutralization (transverse), and stretching (on recession).

This one-second window is the highlight reel of the entire encounter from Earth's point of view.

4.3 Outbound recession: reddening, time-stretched signals, and fading into the noise

After the craft has passed Earth and is moving away, the roles of Doppler and beaming effectively invert.

1. Redshift and de-boosting

- For a receding source, the same Doppler factor that compressed frequencies on approach now stretches them: $\nu_{\text{obs}} = \nu_0 / D$ for a nearly direct receding component.
- Visible-band emission in the ship's rest frame shifts toward red, then into infrared and longer wavelengths as the alignment becomes more purely receding.

- Relativistic beaming now directs most of the emission into the direction of motion, *away* from Earth, so we see a rapid drop in received intensity beyond the geometric $1/r^2$ dimming.

2. Apparent slowing of variability

The onboard processes that were seen sped up by D on approach are now seen slowed by approximately the same factor on recession:

- $T_{\text{obs,out}} \sim D T_0$.

To instruments on Earth:

- Any pulsed beacon that ticked at, say, 1 Hz in its own frame and appeared at ~ 100 Hz on approach might appear at ~ 0.01 Hz (one pulse every ~ 100 s) once fully receding.
- The craft's internal "clock," if detectably encoded in its signals, seems to slide from fast-forward to slow motion as it passes by and departs.

3. Long tail for radio and high-sensitivity observations

While the visible-light show is over within seconds to minutes, radio telescopes and other sensitive instruments could, in principle, track the object for many hours:

- The position on the sky continues to drift outward, but more slowly as the distance grows.
- The flux density drops, but radio receivers can integrate over long intervals to maintain detection.
- Observers would see a characteristic chirp in both frequency and timing: a broadband source sweeping from blue-shifted to red-shifted bands, and modulated signals stretching progressively in time.

Eventually, however, the combination of distance, redshift, and de-beaming pushes the craft's emission below the local noise floor, and it becomes indistinguishable from the background.

4.4 Length contraction vs optical appearance: why we do not simply "see" a shorter ship

In popular accounts of relativity, one often hears that "moving objects contract in the direction of motion," suggesting that a relativistic spacecraft would *look* like a squashed version of itself to an Earth observer. In reality, two effects prevent such a simple visual interpretation:

1. Limited angular resolution

At realistic encounter distances, the spacecraft is effectively a point source for the naked eye and a barely-resolved object even for large telescopes:

- During the one-second Earth–Moon threading, its angular size is tiny compared to the instrument point-spread function.
- Any subtle shape distortion is swamped by motion blur, atmospheric seeing, and instrument limits.

This alone would make it extremely hard to directly “see” length contraction.

2. Terrell rotation and light-time structure

Even in an idealized setting with infinite resolution, the apparent shape of a relativistically moving object is not a simple Lorentz-contracted version of its rest-frame shape. The reasons are:

- To form an image at a given Earth time t , one must collect photons that left different parts of the object at different emission times t_{em} , chosen such that $t = t_{\text{em}} + (\text{distance_to_observer})/c$.
- For a moving object, these equal-arrival-time conditions carve out a tilted slice through the object’s worldtube, equivalent to a rotated version of the object rather than a uniformly squashed one.

This is the essence of the Terrell–Penrose result: a rapidly moving sphere, for example, still casts a circular outline but appears rotated, with additional surface region “around the limb” visible. A rod or ship of finite extent similarly appears distorted and rotated, not straightforwardly shortened in the camera frame.

For the relativistic probe in our scenario, this means:

- The spacecraft’s *coordinate length* along the direction of motion is indeed reduced by a factor $1/\gamma$ in the Earth–Sun frame.
- However, the optical appearance is determined by a combination of:
 - Light-travel geometry (which parts we see at once),
 - Aberration (which directions are mapped into which parts of the image),
 - And motion blur (the craft moves appreciably during any realistic exposure time).

The net result is that Earth observers do *not* simply see “a shorter ship.” Instead, if they could resolve it at all, they would see a highly distorted, possibly rotated, and rapidly moving shape whose details are dominated by aberration and light–time effects, not by a naive visual manifestation of $L' = L_0 / \gamma$.

In practice, given the distances and the brevity of the encounter, the relativistic spacecraft is observationally a bright, moving point with exotic timing and spectral behavior. Length contraction is a real geometrical relation between frames, but its direct visualization demands an idealized, controlled setup—not a one–second, near–light–speed streak across the Earth’s sky.

5. Coordinate vs Optical Relativity: Untangling the Effects

The Earth–Moon flyby is an excuse to confront a central confusion in special relativity: the difference between how events are related in spacetime (coordinate relations between frames) and how those events *look* to an observer who only has access to light arriving along their past light cone.

In the spacecraft frame, Earth–Moon distance really is contracted and the Earth’s orbital period really is dilated. In the Earth frame, the spacecraft’s internal clock really does tick more slowly. But nobody ever “sees” these facts directly; they infer them by correcting for light travel times and relativistic optics. During a near– c flyby this distinction is not cosmetic; it completely controls what the encounter looks like.

5.1 Time dilation and length contraction as invariant relations between frames

Time dilation and length contraction are statements about how two inertial frames S and S' assign coordinates to the *same* physical events.

- Time dilation:
If two ticks of a moving clock are separated by a proper time $\Delta\tau$ in its own rest frame, then in any frame where that clock moves at speed v (with $\beta = v / c$ and $\gamma = 1 / \sqrt{1 - \beta^2}$), the time between those ticks is

$$\Delta t = \gamma * \Delta\tau.$$

In words: everyone agrees the moving clock ticks more slowly *in their coordinates* by the same factor γ .

- Length contraction:

If a rod has proper length L_0 in its own rest frame, then in any frame where the rod moves along its length at speed v , the length measured between its endpoints *simultaneously in that frame* is

$$L = L_0 / \gamma.$$

Again: everyone agrees that, when you insist on simultaneity in your own frame, moving things are shorter along the direction of motion by $1 / \gamma$.

These are *coordinate* relations. They arise from the Lorentz transformation, and they are “invariant” in the sense that all inertial observers agree on the value of γ and will derive consistent dilation/contraction factors between frames.

In our flyby:

- In the spacecraft frame S' , the Earth–Moon separation along the line of motion is $D_{EM}' = D_{EM} / \gamma$, and the Earth’s orbital period is $T_E' = \gamma * T_E$.
- In the Earth–Sun frame S , the spacecraft’s proper time between two onboard ticks $\Delta\tau$ appears as $\Delta t = \gamma * \Delta\tau$, and the spacecraft’s own length is $L = L_0 / \gamma$.

None of this tells you what anyone *sees* through a telescope. For that you need to layer on light propagation and optics.

5.2 Light-cone structure, signal delay, and apparent motion

What an observer actually experiences at a given instant is all the light reaching them at that event. This light has traveled at finite speed c from different sources. So:

- You do *not* see where something “is now” in your coordinates.
- You see where it *was* when it emitted the photons that are just arriving.

Mathematically: each “now” on your worldline has a past light cone. The intersection of that cone with other worldlines determines which events you see at that instant.

This has two important consequences for the flyby:

1. Apparent position and shape can differ from coordinate position and shape. Because different parts of an extended object are at different distances and moving during the emission, the equal–arrival–time surface cuts through its history in a skewed

way. That's why a moving sphere looks rotated, not simply squashed: we are seeing a tilted slice through its worldtube.

2. Apparent motion can be faster or slower than coordinate motion.

For the spacecraft seen from Earth:

- As it approaches, we receive photons that left it when it was *closer* to us than its coordinate position at the moment of observation might suggest, because it has kept moving in the meantime. This can make its apparent motion across the sky look non-intuitive, sometimes faster-than-expected.
- On recession, the reverse happens; we see it in a kind of delayed echo.

Similarly, from the spacecraft:

- Even though Earth and Moon are Lorentz-contracted in S' at any given S' -time, the visible image at a given moment of spacecraft proper time τ is built from photons that left different parts of Earth and Moon at different emission times. The geometry of these emission events, not simply $D_{EM}' = D_{EM} / \gamma$, controls the apparent separation, phases, and surface features.

The general lesson: coordinate relativity (dilation, contraction) works on spacetime events; optical relativity works on the light paths that connect those events to observers. They are related but not identical.

5.3 Transverse Doppler vs longitudinal Doppler in the flyby

Doppler effects link *frequency and timing* of received signals to relative motion. At relativistic speeds there are two conceptually distinct pieces:

- Longitudinal Doppler: due to motion along the line of sight.
When the source approaches, frequencies are multiplied by a factor $D > 1$ and arrival times between pulses are divided by D (signals look sped up). When the source recedes, the inverse happens.
- Transverse Doppler: due purely to time dilation when the motion is perpendicular to the line of sight.
Even if the source moves exactly sideways relative to us, its moving clock is still time-dilated, so its emission frequency is reduced by a factor γ and its period increased by γ in our frame. This is a *redshift* with no “classical” Doppler counterpart.

The full relativistic Doppler factor for arbitrary angle is a product of these two ingredients: one from time dilation, one from the component of motion along the line of sight.

In the flyby as seen from Earth:

- Far inbound: the spacecraft has a large velocity component toward us. Longitudinal Doppler dominates; we see strong blueshift and its signals appear sped up and compressed in time by a large factor D .
- Near closest approach: the geometry becomes more transverse: the vector from Earth to spacecraft is almost perpendicular to the spacecraft's velocity. Here:
 - Longitudinal Doppler almost vanishes.
 - The only remaining effect is transverse: a modest redshift and slowing of its internal processes by roughly γ .

If you could continuously monitor a beacon on the ship, you'd see its pulse rate slide from "way too fast" on approach, down through "almost normal," and then into "slow motion" on recession.

- Outbound: the line-of-sight component flips sign and points away from us. Now longitudinal Doppler again dominates but in the red direction: signals are stretched in time, and frequencies shift to lower values. The same 1 Hz beacon that appeared at ~ 100 Hz on approach might appear at ~ 0.01 Hz on recession.

From the spacecraft's perspective looking at Earth and Moon, the same structure applies in reverse: Earth's rotation, radio broadcasts, or artificial signals would appear sped up on approach, slowed near transverse closest approach, and stretched on recession.

5.4 The distinction between "how fast their clock runs" and "how frequently pulses arrive"

A subtle but crucial point is the difference between:

1. Intrinsic clock rate in your coordinates
(*"How fast does their time pass in my frame?"*)
This is controlled by γ only. If you adopt your own inertial frame and assign coordinates to clock ticks on another worldline, time dilation tells you that their proper time accumulates more slowly. This is a geometric property of spacetime and the Lorentz transformation.
2. Observed pulse rate in your detectors
(*"How often do I receive their pulses?"*)

This is controlled by both time dilation and the light–travel geometry (Doppler). It depends on:

- The relative velocity along the line of sight.
- The changing distance and angle between source and observer.
- When the pulses were emitted versus when they are received.

In the flyby:

- From Earth’s point of view, the spacecraft’s onboard clock is always running slow by a factor γ in our coordinates. That is a pure time dilation statement and does *not* change sign as it passes.
- However, the received pulses from that clock behave differently:
 - On approach, we receive them more often than once per γ seconds, because each later pulse is emitted closer to us and thus has less distance to cover; the shortening of light path between pulses partially cancels and then overcompensates time dilation, leading to net speedup.
 - At exact transverse geometry, the path length between successive pulses changes very little, so we see them separated by roughly γ times their proper interval: this is where the observed rate comes closest to reflecting pure time dilation.
 - On recession, each later pulse is emitted farther away, so it takes more time to reach us; this adds to the dilated emission interval and makes the received pulses more widely spaced than $\gamma * T_0$, giving a net slowdown.

A similar story holds from the spacecraft’s perspective regarding Earth’s clocks and signals.

This distinction helps resolve common confusions:

- “If their clock is slow, why do I see it speed up when they approach?”
Because time dilation governs emission intervals in your coordinates; Doppler and light-travel geometry determine how those emissions are stacked and spread when they reach you.
- “If we both see each other as time-dilated, isn’t that contradictory?”
No, because each observer’s judgments about the other’s clock rate are made in different frames with different simultaneity slices, and neither judgment is based purely on raw observed pulse rates; they must correct for signal delay and motion to infer coordinate behavior.

In the context of the Earth–Moon flyby, this means:

- Time dilation and length contraction shape the underlying geometry and dynamics of the event in each frame.
- Relativistic Doppler, aberration, and light-cone structure sculpt what observers actually see.
- The one–second streak across Earth’s sky and the millisecond flash in the spacecraft’s cabin are both consistent with the same spacetime picture, but they are linked only after carefully disentangling “what coordinates say” from “what photons do.”

6. Is 0.9999 c Really the Most Interesting Speed?

Up to this point we have treated $v = 0.9999 c$ as a kind of “ultimate” case for the flyby, because it produces spectacular Lorentz factors and dramatic contraction of the Earth–Moon separation in the spacecraft frame. But from the point of view of *observers on Earth*, there is a different question to ask:

At what speed is the event richest and most interpretable in human-visible light, on human timescales?

Once we frame it this way, “as fast as possible” is not obviously the right answer. There is a trade-off between extremal relativistic effects and the ability of human eyes and instruments to actually register them in a useful way.

6.1 Parameter sweep: γ and Doppler factor as functions of β

Two key functions of the dimensionless speed $\beta = v/c$ control nearly all of the relativistic phenomenology:

- Lorentz factor:

$$\gamma(\beta) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 - \beta^2}}$$

- Head-on Doppler factor (approach):

$$D(\beta) = \sqrt{\frac{1 + \beta}{1 - \beta}}$$

Time dilation and length contraction scale with γ ; blueshift and “speed-up” of observed periodic signals along the line of sight scale with D . As $\beta \rightarrow 1$, both functions diverge.

Some representative values:

- $\beta = 0.9$:
 $\gamma \approx 2.3, D \approx 4.4$
- $\beta = 0.95$:
 $\gamma \approx 3.2, D \approx 6.4$
- $\beta = 0.99$:
 $\gamma \approx 7.1, D \approx 14$
- $\beta = 0.999$:
 $\gamma \approx 22.4, D \approx 45$
- $\beta = 0.9999$:
 $\gamma \approx 70.7, D \approx 141$

These numbers already show two competing tendencies:

1. Physics effect strength
 - Higher γ means stronger time dilation and length contraction.
 - Higher D means stronger blueshift and more dramatic compression of observed time series on approach.
2. Shift in observational band and timescale
 - As D grows, rest-frame visible emission is pushed into ultraviolet or X-ray; rest-frame variability becomes too fast or too slow (on recession) for human perception.
 - Meanwhile, the *coordinate* duration of interesting events in the Earth–Sun frame, such as the Earth–Moon crossing, shrinks as $t_{\text{event}} \sim L/v$, asymptotically approaching L/c .

So increasing β beyond a certain point yields diminishing returns for *visible* astronomy: you gain in formal extremeness but lose in “watchability.”

6.2 Too fast to see? Trade-offs between extremal effects and human-scale observability

From an Earth observer’s standpoint, there are three practical constraints:

1. Event duration in the sky

The time to cross the Earth–Moon separation is

$$t_{\text{EM}} \approx \frac{D_{\text{EM}}}{v}.$$

For all β in 0.95–0.9999, this is around one second (varying by only a few tens of percent). So even at “merely” 0.95 c, the event is already right at the lower limit of what humans can track as a moving object. Pushing to 0.9999 c does not buy orders-of-magnitude shorter time; it shaves fractions of a second off an already blink-length event.

2. Spectral shift into or out of the visible band

Suppose the spacecraft emits a broadband spectrum peaking in the visible in its own rest frame. On approach:

- At $\beta \approx 0.95$, $D \sim 6$: visible light shifts toward blue/UV, but much of it remains in or near the visible band; IR emission can move into the visible, enriching what we see.
- At $\beta \approx 0.99$, $D \sim 14$: visible moves deeper into blue/near-UV; thermal IR, radio, or other lower-energy components can be promoted into the visible.
- At $\beta \approx 0.9999$, $D \sim 141$: any rest-frame visible light is pushed so far toward the UV/X-ray that the visible band may be dominated instead by what was originally deep IR or radio. For many plausible emission models, the *total* flux in the visible band can actually diminish.

To a human observer, excessively large D therefore risks turning “brilliant blue object” into “mostly non-visible flare,” requiring specialized detectors.

3. Instrumental limits on time resolution and dynamic range

Cameras and photometers have finite frame rates and dynamic ranges:

- At moderate relativistic speeds, a high-speed camera could record tens to hundreds of frames during the brightest part of the pass, resolving color and brightness evolution.

- At extreme speeds with very large Doppler factors, flux can spike so strongly and briefly that sensors saturate or miss the peak, especially if exposure times are not perfectly tuned.

In this sense, there is an “observational sweet spot” where relativistic effects are unmistakable but the event still unfolds in a way that our eyes and instruments can meaningfully sample.

6.3 A proposed “sweet spot” near 0.98–0.99 c for visible-band drama

The combination of the above considerations suggests that speeds in the range

$$v \approx (0.98\text{--}0.99) c$$

may be more *visually interesting* from Earth than the more extreme 0.9999 c case.

In this regime:

- γ is large enough (about 5–7) that:
 - Time dilation and length contraction are solidly relativistic.
 - The Earth–Moon separation in the spacecraft frame shrinks by a factor of several, making for a compressed but not absurdly tiny double-planet geometry.
- D is large but not overwhelming (about 10–15), so:
 - On approach, visible light shifts strongly toward blue, but much of the spectrum stays in the optical or near-UV; humans and standard CCDs can still capture it.
 - IR and radio components can be up-shifted into the visible, creating rich color structure rather than simply bleaching everything into high-energy radiation.
 - On recession, the same factor works in reverse, yielding a strongly reddened afterglow that can still be followed with optical and near-IR instruments.
- The one-to-few-second crossing time is effectively unchanged from the more extreme case, so:
 - The event is still dramatic and brief.
 - But the *internal* relativistic time distortions in observable signals (e.g., beacon pulses) are in a range where high-speed cameras and radio receivers can track them with multiple samples per characteristic timescale, rather than seeing them compressed into a single frame or smeared below detection.

This sweet spot therefore maximizes:

- The *contrast* between Newtonian expectations and relativistic reality (clear Doppler color swings, obvious time distortion in signals).
- The *accessibility* of the event to both human vision and standard astronomical instruments.

By contrast, at 0.9999 c the encounter is so extreme that most of its informative content is pushed into bands and timescales that require specialized preparations and may not translate into a better “show” for typical observers.

6.4 Designing observational campaigns for hypothetical relativistic probes

If one takes seriously the possibility of relativistic probes crossing the inner solar system—whether human-made or extraterrestrial—the above analysis has practical implications for how we might design observational strategies.

Several components suggest themselves:

1. Multi-band monitoring with flexible triggering
 - Optical wide-field surveys (e.g., large synoptic telescopes) could be configured to flag fast-moving, fast-brightening point sources with unusual color evolution.
 - Simultaneous near-UV and near-IR bands would help track Doppler shifts that move emission in and out of the visible.
 - Radio and X-ray facilities could be triggered automatically once an object with relativistic kinematics is suspected.
2. High-cadence photometry and spectroscopy
 - Dedicated high-speed photometers (kHz frame rates) could resolve the sub-second structure of the Earth–Moon crossing, measuring:
 - The changing spectral energy distribution during approach, transverse passage, and recession.
 - The apparent speed-up and slow-down of any periodic or quasi-periodic signals.

- Rapid-response spectrographs could sample line and continuum shifts across broad wavelength ranges to reconstruct the effective Doppler factor as a function of time.
3. All-sky astrometric tracking
- Wide-field astrometric instruments could record the spacecraft’s trajectory across the celestial sphere with millisecond sampling, allowing reconstruction of the true 3D path and speed.
 - Combining astrometry with Doppler-derived speeds would permit a full relativistic fit: one could infer not only v and direction but also test consistency between coordinate kinematics and observed Doppler/time-dilation signatures.
4. Forward modeling and template libraries
- Prior to any detection, one can build a library of synthetic events: simulated lightcurves, spectra, and sky tracks for probes at various speeds (0.9–0.9999 c) and trajectories (near-misses, direct Earth–Moon threading, grazing planetary encounters).
 - These templates would guide real-time classification: once a candidate is detected, matching its behavior to a template could quickly constrain its speed and emission characteristics and drive follow-up observations.

In all these designs, the lesson from our thought experiment is that “more relativistic” is not automatically “more observable.” A realistic survey should be tuned to a range of speeds where relativistic signatures are prominent yet still live in the bands and time windows that our instruments and analysis pipelines handle best—precisely the 0.98–0.99 c regime that appears, from Earth’s vantage point, to be the most visually and scientifically rewarding.

7. Pedagogical and Experimental Implications

The Earth–Moon relativistic flyby is not just a science-fiction vignette; it’s an unusually compact way to gather much of special relativity’s “weirdness” into one scenario. It forces students (and researchers) to keep three layers straight at once: invariant spacetime relations, frame-dependent coordinates, and light-cone-limited appearance. It also points naturally toward practical questions about how we would simulate or even detect such an event.

Here we sketch how this thought experiment can serve as a teaching tool, a blueprint for numerical visualization, and a conceptual bridge to interstellar probe design and SETI-style searches for fast movers.

7.1 Using the Earth–Moon flyby as a teaching example of relativistic optics

Most introductory relativity courses stop at time dilation and length contraction; if optics is discussed at all, it's usually in the abstract. The Earth–Moon flyby gives instructors a concrete, astronomy-flavored problem that forces students to grapple with:

- Two genuinely different questions
 1. What do coordinates in each inertial frame say?
 2. What does each observer actually *see*?

By letting the spacecraft pass between Earth and Moon:

- Students already know the baseline geometry and timescales (Earth–Moon distance, one-second-ish light crossing time).
- They immediately see that “pancaked Earth” is wrong; once Terrell rotation and light-travel time are introduced, the planet remains visibly round.
- They confront relativistic aberration not as a formula, but as a drawing: almost everything gets pushed into the forward view of the spacecraft, while Earth sees the ship confined to a narrow streak.

As a teaching device, one can structure a sequence of exercises:

1. Kinematic warm-up
 - Compute γ and D for several β values.
 - Compute Earth–Moon separation in the spacecraft frame.
 - Compute transit times in both frames.
2. Optical mapping
 - Use the aberration formula to map directions from the Earth–Sun frame to the spacecraft sky.
 - Show that Earth and Moon end up nearly co-located in the forward cone.
3. Doppler and timing
 - Ask students to compute observed pulse periods for a beacon on the craft as seen from Earth (approach, transverse, recession).
 - Invert the problem: from a measured chirp, infer β .

4. Concept check

- Pose questions like: “If we see pulses speeding up, does that mean their clock is running faster?” and use the flyby story to disentangle time dilation vs Doppler.

Because the scenario is visually evocative (“a ship screams between Earth and Moon in a second”), it tends to stick in memory. It becomes a mental template for future discussions of aberration, Doppler, and the difference between spacetime geometry and appearance.

7.2 Possible numerical simulations and ray-tracing visualizations of the scenario

Beyond pencil-and-paper exercises, the flyby is almost tailor-made for computer graphics and numerical relativity projects. A minimal simulator would require:

1. Worldline and ephemeris engine

- Represent the Sun, Earth, Moon, and spacecraft as worldlines in Minkowski spacetime.
- Use a simple ephemeris (circular orbits are enough for pedagogy) to evolve Earth and Moon in the Earth–Sun frame.
- Integrate the spacecraft trajectory at constant β .

2. Observer modules

- An Earth observer module that, for each observation time t , finds where the spacecraft was when it emitted photons that arrive at that time (solve retarded-time conditions).
- A spacecraft observer module that does the analogous calculation for Earth, Moon, and Sun.

3. Relativistic ray-tracing

- For each pixel in a virtual camera, trace rays backward from the observer through spacetime, intersecting them with source worldtubes (Earth, Moon, ship).
- Apply aberration and Doppler to transform emitted intensities and colors into received ones.
- Incorporate Terrell rotation for extended bodies by using equal-arrival-time surfaces on their worldtubes rather than naïve instantaneous shapes.

4. Rendering pipeline

- Produce time-resolved frames of what the spacecraft sees: Earth and Moon swelling, aberrating, changing color, then vanishing.
- Produce corresponding frames of what an Earth telescope sees: the craft brightening, streaking between Earth and Moon, and reddening into the distance.

A more sophisticated version could include:

- Instrument response curves (human eye, CCD, IR cameras, radio receivers), letting users switch “detector modes” and see how the event differs by band.
- Adjustable β sliders to explore the trade-off between relativistic extremeness and visibility.
- Multiple vantage points on Earth’s surface, showing that the streak differs in path and timing depending on observer location.

Such a simulator would be a powerful teaching and outreach tool: students could literally “watch” the same event from different frames, seeing how the mathematics of Lorentz transformations map into differing movies. It would also provide testbeds for data-analysis pipelines intended to detect fast movers in survey data.

7.3 Connections to interstellar probe concepts and SETI-style detection strategies

The thought experiment is not purely academic. Concepts for interstellar probes—laser-pushed sails, fusion or antimatter rockets, even beamed lightcraft—routinely entertain velocities in the $\beta \sim 0.1\text{--}0.3$ range, and theoretical discussions go higher. Likewise, SETI has begun to ask how we might detect “non-standard” technosignatures, including fast, compact objects crossing the inner solar system.

The Earth–Moon flyby analysis immediately suggests several connections:

1. Signatures of artificial relativistic probes

A real relativistic probe is unlikely to be a passive rock. It might:

- Emit deliberate beacons or data streams with known or engineered modulation patterns.
- Have waste heat signatures and non-thermal emission spectra reflective of propulsion or onboard power systems.

- Follow trajectories that thread near planets or moons for reconnaissance or slingshots.

Our scenario shows that such a probe would present characteristic Doppler chirps, color swings, and angular speeds that sharply distinguish it from natural meteors, asteroids, or comets.

2. SETI: looking for fast, chirped transients

Surveys that already search for fast radio bursts, optical transients, or near-Earth objects could be augmented with filters that:

- Identify point sources whose spectrum and apparent motion are consistent with near-relativistic motion.
- Look for signals whose frequency and arrival times follow the predicted Doppler evolution for a passing relativistic object (blueward and compressed on approach, neutral near closest approach, then redward and stretched on recession).
- Exploit the fact that such an object might traverse large angular distances in seconds, leaving tracklets in high-cadence survey fields.

The Earth–Moon threading scenario is an extreme case, but it sketches the envelope of what such events might look like and how to distinguish them from noise and artifacts.

3. Interstellar mission planning: what will we look like to them?

For designers of future human-made probes, the same logic can be flipped:

- If we send a near- c sail past another star system, what will *they* see?
- How should we encode information in our beacon so that the combined time dilation and Doppler effects still leave it interpretable to a civilization at rest with respect to the target star?
- How close can we sensibly pass objects (planets, moons) without compressing the encounter into an observationally useless blink?

The Earth–Moon case provides a template for these questions: it couples realistic orbital scales with relativistic speeds and shows how much “viewing time” an external observer has to work with.

In short, the Earth–Moon relativistic flyby is a bridge between classroom relativity and forward-looking experimental and exploratory questions. It nudges us to think of special relativity not just as a correction to Newtonian dynamics, but as a design constraint and opportunity: it

shapes how we would recognize the passage of a fast visitor and how we ourselves might choose to announce our presence when we become that fast visitor in someone else's sky.

8. Conclusion: Relativistic Astronomy as Lived Experience

The Earth–Moon flyby at near–light speed takes special relativity out of the realm of diagrams and places it in the sky, as something observers could in principle *live through*. In the spacecraft frame, the solar system collapses into a forward–aberrated, Doppler–blazed panorama dominated by a compressed Earth–Moon double. In the Earth–Sun frame, the same event is a one–second streak across the sky, embedded in a day–long passage through the solar system and a much longer relativistic cruise.

By walking both descriptions in parallel, we unmask the subtle interplay between invariant spacetime relations and the optical appearances that observers actually register. The result is less about a single thought experiment and more about a style of thinking: astronomy done with Lorentz geometry in one hand and ray-traced photons in the other.

8.1 Summary of key visual and temporal features in both frames

In the spacecraft frame:

- The Earth–Moon separation along the trajectory is Lorentz–contracted from $\sim 3.8 \times 10^5$ km to of order 10^3 – 10^4 km, depending on γ . For $\gamma \approx 70$, Earth and Moon become a tightly spaced pair whose centers are separated by less than an Earth diameter in coordinate space.
- Relativistic aberration drags almost the entire celestial sphere into a forward cone of half–angle $\approx 1/\gamma$. Earth, Moon, Sun, and background stars all crowd into this tiny forward window; the impression is not of a universe surrounding you, but of a universe stacked in front of you.
- Terrell rotation ensures that Earth and Moon remain visually spherical. Their limbs stay circular, but their visible hemispheres are skewed and distorted, revealing features from “around the edge” that would be hidden in a non-relativistic view.
- Doppler shift and beaming turn the Earth–Moon pair into a violent, asymmetric light show: strongly blueshifted and intensely bright on approach, briefly closer to “normal” color near transverse passage, then rapidly reddened and dimmed on recession.

- The coordinate orbital periods of Earth and Moon are dilated by γ : a 1-year orbit becomes decades, a 27-day lunar month becomes several years. Yet during the milliseconds of proper time in which the craft actually threads the Earth–Moon gap, these slow orbital drifts are effectively frozen; what dominates is the ship’s own rapid passage.

In the Earth–Sun frame:

- The spacecraft crosses the $\sim 100\text{AU}$ sphere of the “solar system” in roughly a day, but spends only $\sim 1\text{--}2\text{ s}$ within the Earth–Moon distance scale. For ground observers, the event is a one-second highlight reel.
- Far inbound, the craft appears as a faint, bluish point whose flicker and spectral lines are Doppler-compressed and shifted; its apparent variability speeds up as it nears.
- Near closest approach, the craft sweeps across tens of degrees of sky per second, appearing as a brilliant, fast-moving point or short streak, perhaps briefly skimming the lunar limb for a tiny subset of observers.
- On recession, its emission is strongly reddened and time-stretched; signals that seemed accelerated on approach now slide into slow motion. The object fades into the noise in the optical but could remain trackable in radio for many hours.
- Despite the spacecraft’s coordinate length being contracted by $1/\gamma$, Earth observers do not simply “see a shorter ship” — limited angular resolution, motion blur, and Terrell-type effects conspire to make it observationally a point source, not a visual demonstration of $L = L_0/\gamma$.

Both frames describe the same spacetime event, but each packages it into a radically different lived experience.

8.2 Lessons about the difference between invariant physics and appearance

The flyby crystallizes several conceptual lessons:

1. Time dilation and length contraction are about coordinates, not raw perception.
The factor γ connects how different inertial frames assign times and lengths to the same events. Nobody looks through a telescope and “sees” a factor of γ directly. Instead, we infer it by modeling the geometry and correcting for signal delays and Doppler.
2. Light-cone structure governs what we see.
At any moment, an observer sees only those events that lie on their past light cone. For

moving, extended objects, equal–arrival–time slices through their worldtubes are skewed; this is why moving spheres look rotated and why apparent motion can differ from coordinate motion.

3. Doppler and time dilation are conceptually distinct.

Time dilation answers, “How does their proper time relate to my coordinate time?”

Doppler answers, “How are emission times mapped to my reception times?” In the flyby, the spacecraft’s clock is always slow in Earth coordinates, yet we can see its pulses speed up on approach and slow down on recession because light-path geometry adds to or subtracts from that underlying dilation.

4. Appearance is frame- and geometry-dependent, but the spacetime story is not.

In the spacecraft frame, it is Earth and Moon that are contracted, time-dilated, and aberrated; in the Earth frame, the spacecraft bears those properties. Both stories are consistent slices through a single Lorentz-invariant spacetime. The divergence lies in what each observer can actually see during their brief encounter.

These distinctions are not academic; they are exactly what one must master to interpret real high-speed astrophysical phenomena or to design and understand near-relativistic missions.

8.3 Future directions: from thought experiments to full relativistic sky simulators

The Earth–Moon relativistic flyby is one scenario; there are many others. The next natural step is to move from static thought experiments to interactive relativistic sky simulators that let users inhabit different frames and watch events unfold.

Several directions suggest themselves:

- Educational platforms

Build tools where students can:

- Choose a speed and trajectory for a spacecraft.
- Select “Earth view” or “ship view.”
- Watch the sky evolve with aberration, Doppler, and Terrell effects turned on or off.

This would make relativity something you can *play* with rather than merely calculate.

- Research-grade ray-tracing engines

For high-speed astrophysical jets, pulsar environments, or hypothetical relativistic probes, one can:

- Couple real ephemerides and spacetime metrics (flat or curved) to a photon-shooting engine.
- Generate synthetic observations for specific instruments and bands.
- Test data-analysis pipelines for fast transients and extreme kinematic signatures.

- Mission and SETI applications

For human or robotic interstellar probes:

- Simulators could optimize beacon design so that, after Doppler and time-dilation distortions, signals remain interpretable to target civilizations.

For SETI:

- Template banks derived from relativistic sky simulations could be used to search survey data for exactly the kind of one-second streaks and chirped signals we have described.

- Public visualization and outreach

Finally, full relativistic renderings of events like an Earth–Moon flyby have obvious outreach potential: they make relativity tangible. A single animation showing Earth and Moon as seen from a $0.99c$ ship, juxtaposed with what Earth sees of the ship, compresses pages of equations into a few seconds of visceral understanding.

In that sense, “relativistic astronomy as lived experience” is not just a slogan. It is an emerging mode of thinking where we treat Lorentz invariance, light cones, and observer-dependent appearance as equal partners. The Earth–Moon flyby is our first test case, but the same toolkit is ready to be applied wherever velocities are high enough that the sky itself begins to warp.

References

1. Lampa, A. (1924). *Wie erscheint nach der Relativitätstheorie ein bewegter Stab einem ruhenden Beobachter?* Zeitschrift für Physik, 27, 138–148. [Tempolimit Lichtgeschwindigkeit+1](#)
2. Terrell, J. (1959). *Invisibility of the Lorentz contraction*. Physical Review, 116(4), 1041–1045. [Physical Review+1](#)
3. Penrose, R. (1959). *The apparent shape of a relativistically moving sphere*. Mathematical Proceedings of the Cambridge Philosophical Society, 55(1), 137–139. [Cambridge University Press & Assessment+1](#)
4. Boas, M. L. (1961). *Apparent shape of large objects at relativistic speeds*. American Journal of Physics, 29, 283–286. [Tempolimit Lichtgeschwindigkeit](#)
5. Weisskopf, V. F. (1960). *The visual appearance of rapidly moving objects*. Physics Today, 13(9), 24–27. [Tempolimit Lichtgeschwindigkeit](#)
6. Suffern, K. G. (1988). *The apparent shape of a rapidly moving sphere*. American Journal of Physics, 56(8), 729–733. [AIP Publishing+1](#)
7. Kraus, U. (2000). *Brightness and color of rapidly moving objects: The visual appearance of a large sphere revisited*. American Journal of Physics, 68(1), 56–60. [AIP Publishing+1](#)
8. Kraus, U. (2008). *First-person visualizations of the special and general theory of relativity*. European Journal of Physics, 29, 1–13. [arXiv+1](#)
9. McKinley, J. M., & Doherty, P. (1979). *In search of the “starbow”: The appearance of the starfield from a relativistic spaceship*. American Journal of Physics, 47(4), 309–316. [AIP Publishing+1](#)
10. Stimets, R. W., & Sheldon, E. (1981). *The celestial view from a relativistic starship*. Journal of the British Interplanetary Society, 34, 83–99. [bis-space.com+1](#)
11. McKinley, J. M. (1980). *Relativistic transformation of solid angle*. American Journal of Physics, 48(8), 612–614. [mujoptol.cz+1](#)
12. Howard, A., Dance, S., & Kitchen, L. (1995). *Relativistic ray-tracing: Simulating the visual appearance of rapidly moving objects*. Technical Report 95/21, Department of Computer Science, University of Melbourne. [ResearchGate+1](#)
13. Black, D. V., Gopi, M., Wessel, F., Pajarola, R., & Kuester, F. (2007). *Visualizing flat spacetime: Viewing optical versus special relativistic effects*. American Journal of Physics, 75(6), 540–545. [arXiv+1](#)

14. Weiskopf, D., Borchers, M., Ertl, T., Falk, M., Fechtig, O., Frank, R., *et al.* (2006). *Explanatory and illustrative visualization of special and general relativity*. IEEE Transactions on Visualization and Computer Graphics, 12(4), 522–534. [PPNEC - From Photonics to Polaritonics+1](#)
15. Müller, T. (2014). *GeoViS—Relativistic ray tracing in four-dimensional spacetimes*. Computer Physics Communications, 185(8), 2301–2308. [ORCID+1](#)
16. Taylor, E. F., & Wheeler, J. A. (1992). *Spacetime Physics: Introduction to Special Relativity* (2nd ed.). W. H. Freeman. [eftaylor.com](#)
17. Matloff, G. L. (2005). *Deep-Space Probes: To the Outer Solar System and Beyond* (2nd ed.). Springer Praxis. [SpringerLink+1](#)
18. Freitas, R. A., Jr. (1980). *Interstellar probes: A new approach to SETI*. Journal of the British Interplanetary Society, 33, 95–100. [bis-space.com+1](#)
19. Forgan, D. H., Papadogiannakis, S., & Kitching, T. (2013). *The effect of probe dynamics on galactic exploration timescales*. Journal of the British Interplanetary Society, 66(5/6), 171–177. [arXiv+1](#)
20. Lubin, P. (2016). *A roadmap to interstellar flight*. Journal of the British Interplanetary Society, 69, 40–72; see also arXiv:1604.01356 and NASA NIAC Final Report. [arXiv+1](#)
21. Hornof, D., *et al.* (2025). *A snapshot of relativistic motion: Visualizing the Terrell effect*. Communications Physics / Nature Partner Journal (title and venue as given in early online version). [arXiv+1](#)

The author has published over 4,500 papers at <https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Douglas-Youvan/research>. Google Scholar has indexed these preprints, and if you want a particular reference, the AI mode of a Google search (Gemini) has efficiently catalogued these preprints.